(e) whether Government have moved the Supreme Court against the decision of Delhi High Court; and

(f) if so, when and what is the outcome and if not, the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI CHINTA MOHAN): (a) to (f) The Writ Petition was filed by M/s. Glaxo in the Delhi High Court 21-7-90 against the Govt's Notice dated 18-6-1990 conveying the (tentative liability of the Company as Rs. 66.35 crores. Since then, adjournments have taken place on account of various reasons which generally become unavoidable in a litigation, like for en-abing the company to amend its Writ Petition in view of the Govt, having increased the tentative liability to Rs. 71.21 crores on 16-11-90, to enable the parties to file counter-affidavits and replies thereto, before and after the said amendment, non-availability of Counsels etc. The case will be defended in the best public interest in accordance with the advice of Govt's legal experts.

Furafefaiiig of details by M/s Hoechst

648. SHRI MOHD. KHALEELUR RAHMAN: SHRI ASHOK NATH VERMA:

Will the PRIME MINIS PER be pleased to. refer to the answer to Unstarred Question 375 given in the Rajya Sabha on the 18th July, 1991 and state:

(a) whether it is a fact that M/s Hoechst did not follow the time schedule and the decision of Bombay High Court in providing in:: - deails required ty Government

!b) if so, what steps have been taken h\ Government in this direction;

(c) whether it is a fact that Government have been asking M/s Hoechst to provide details for the last so many years;

(d) if so, when it was asked for the first time and how many reminders Were sent; and

(e) what action Government are proposing to take under these circumstances?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI CHINTA MO^ HAN): (a) to (e) As envisaged in the Bombay High Court's order dated the 8th March, 1991, M/s Hoechst did make available some information and data before the expiry of 8 weeks' period stipulated in the said order. It was, however, noticed that the information supplied by the company did not tally with the one made available by it in 1987-88 to the Special Team and therefore it needed reconciliation, and the same is frting done. The case will be processed in accordance with the provisions of the DPCOs and the directions of the Courts,

Imoprt Bill of M/s German Remedies

649. SHRI MOHD. KHALEELUR RAHMAN:
SHRI ASHOK NATH VERMA:

Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question 374 given in the Rajya Sabha on the 18th July, 1991 and state:

(a) whether it is a fact that import bill of Ml/s German Remedies which was Rs. 3.67 crores at CIF cost during the year 1987 jumped to Rs. 20 crores during 1990-91;

(b) what are the reasons for such in crease at a time when country is facing foreign exchange problem;

(c) whether it is a fact that company is required to provide imports break up under drug Policy, 1986 and DPCO. 1987;

(d) if so, the details provided by the company; and

(e) when the matter of over invoicing was referred to Finance Ministry and what is the present status?